

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 13-15 are amended, and claims 16-18 are added. Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 14 and 15 are amended to correct informalities. Support for amendments to claims 5 and 13 can be found at least at paragraph [0013]. Support for new claims 16-18 can be found at least at paragraphs [0050-0051] and Fig. 10. Thus, no new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Nguyen in the February 15 personal interview as well as the February 22 telephone interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 1-4 are allowed. Claims 1-4 are amended to correct informalities, and thus those amendments do not add new matter. Thus, the claims satisfy all formal requirements and claims 1-4 remain in allowable condition.

II. The Claims Satisfy 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.¹ This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that the recitation "a plurality of second pixel sections be arranged in the first EL display element" in claim 5, lines 3-4 is unclear. By this Amendment, claim 5 is amended. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

¹ Based on the text of the Office Action, Applicants assume that claim 14 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Office Action asserts that the recitation "each of the second pixel sections being capable of emitting lights" in claim 6, lines 5-6, is unclear. By this Amendment, claim 6 is amended. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action asserts that the recitation "said first section" in claim 14, lines 2-3 is indefinite. By this Amendment, claim 14 is amended. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. Claims 5-14

The Office Action rejects claims 5-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,673,091 to Boisdrone et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Boisdrone does not teach or suggest a manufacturing method of an EL panel including "disposing a first EL element including a TFT layer above said substrate, the TFT layer including a plurality of first pixel sections ... and the first circuit section controlling the emissions of the first pixel sections," and "disposing a second EL display element including a TFT layer," as recited in amended independent claim 5, and as similarly recited in amended independent claim 13.

Boisdrone, instead, merely discloses a liquid crystal display device that includes an assembly of at least first and second display elements. See, e.g., Boisdrone, Abstract. Nowhere in the cited text does Boisdrone disclose a display device that includes a TFT layer, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 13.

Thus, claims 5 and 13 are patentable over Boisdrone. Claims 6-12 depend from claim 5, and claim 14 depends from independent claim 13. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 5-14 are patentable over Boisdrone. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claim 15

The Office Action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,302,468 to Namiki et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts on page 4 that Namiki discloses a manufacturing method that includes forming a layer 21 for filling a gap between the second EL display element and circuit section. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

Namiki does not disclose "forming a layer for filling a gap between the second EL display element and the circuit section," as recited in claim 15. That is, a layer (28) fills the gap 30 in thickness that is formed between the second EL display element and the circuit section 22 that are overlapped as shown in Fig. 9. See, e.g., paragraphs [0047-0048].

The layer 21 of Namiki, instead, causes one extending portion of a transparent electrode (12a) of one lateral side surface of the left side of the substrate (13a) to electrically connect to the extending portion of the transparent electrode (12a) of the right side. See e.g., Namiki, col. 4, lines 5-14. Thus, Namiki does not disclose the formation of a layer for filling a gap, as recited in claim 15.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 15 is patentable over Namiki. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Claims 16-18

None of the applied references teach or suggest a method of manufacturing an EL panel that includes "disposing a first EL element on the first part and a second EL element on the second part, the first part being thicker than the second part, at least a part of the first EL element overlapping the second EL element," as recited in new claim 16.

Further, none of the applied references teach or suggest a method of manufacturing an EL panel that includes, "disposing a first EL element and a second EL element on the

substrate, the first EL element being thicker than the second EL element, at least a part of the first EL element overlapping the second EL element," as recited in new claim 17.

Finally, none of the applied references teach or suggest the method of manufacturing an EL panel, that includes "disposing the first EL element and the second EL element on the main substrate, either the first or the second circuit part not disposed between the first display part and the second display part," as recited in claim 18.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 16-18 are patentable over the applied references.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/cfr

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: March 1, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461